<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 8, 2009. Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 10, and 12 to 14 and 16 to 24 remain pending in the application, with Claims 7, 11 and 15 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16 to 18 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicant's undersigned representative during the October 6, 2009 telephonic interview. This Amendment has been prepared based on the discussions of that interview.

Claims 1 to 12, 14 to 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 wer rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597 (Lonnroth), and Claims 13, 17, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lonnroth. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention of Claims 1 and 16 is directed to a server side that offers a service provided by the server on a communication network. The server sends to a client a service description document in a language for describing web services comprising a description of the type, content and sequencing of data exchanged between the server and any client when the service is executed. The service description document is independent of any client or user characteristic and comprises a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network. Here, the description of the processing functionality comprises a list of properties

supported by the processing functionality, the properties defining at least respectively, the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing, and the type of processing, and the description of the processing functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional.

The latter features are from Claims 7 and 11 and it is submitted that Lonnroth is not seen to teach these features. In this regard, the Office Action alleged that column 5, lines 22 to 25 discloses the features of Claim 11. Applicant disagrees.

Lonnroth is seen to disclose a system for converting service requests from one protocol to another so as to provide the service to a device. For example, a wireless phone may issue a service request in WAP. The WAP request is converted to HTTP for processing in the system of Lonnroth. Specifically, the WAP request is converted to HTTP by gateway 202 and the converted request is provided to pre-processor 240. Here, preprocessor 240 obtains information specific to the user of phone 210 from configuration database 254 and performs any preprocessing (such as authenticating the user). Once the user has been authenticated, the request is processed by the remainder of the system in Lonnroth to output a HTTP response to gateway 202, which is converted back to WAP. Thus, the in Lonnroth, the request is seen to comprise a service request document. There is not seen to be a service description document provided to phone 210 that describes the services provided by the system of Lonnroth. Moreover, even is such a service description document could be found in Lonnroth, Applicant fails to see where any such document includes description of the processing functionality comprises a list of properties supported by the processing functionality, the properties defining at least respectively, the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing, and the type of processing,

and the description of the processing functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional. The portion of Lonnroth at column 5 merely states that preprocessor performs the preprocessing requests on the request for a service. This is not seen to be the same as the features of the invention. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 16, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

In another aspect of the invention according to Claims 13 and 17, the claims are directed to the client side that receives the service description document. More particularly, the client, upon receiving the service description document, performs a check to see if it is able to process the service itself. In more detail, Claim 13 is directed to a method of testing access to a service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description document, comprising the following steps implemented by the client computer, extracting from the service description document, provided by a server computer offering the service, a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network, reading, from the extracted description of the processing functionality, a value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing must be executed by the client computer, reading, from the extracted description of the processing functionality, a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional, and verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when the processing is obligatory and must be executed by the client computer in the communication network.

Lonnroth is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of i) extracting from the service description document, provided by a server computer offering the service, a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network, ii) reading, from the extracted description of the processing functionality, a value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing must be executed by the client computer, iii) reading, from the extracted description of the processing functionality, a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional, and iv) verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when the processing is obligatory and must be executed by the client computer in the communication network.

As discussed above, Lonnroth is not seen to teach that a service description document describing services offered by the system is provided by the system to the client (phone 210). Thus, client (phone 210) is not seen to test whether it can access a service by processing the service description document as claimed. Therefore, Claims 13 and 17, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over Lonnroth.

In yet another aspect of the invention according to Claims 14 and 18, the invention validates a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network. The invention acquires the message by the intermediate computer and extracts, from the service description document, the description of the service associated with the

document. Then, the intermediate computer i) extracts a processing from the received message, ii) acquires from the service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing, iii) verifies whether the imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by the functionality described in the service description document, iv) reads a value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of the message, and v) executes the processing when the read value specifies that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message.

In Lonnroth, the system performs any processing required and the processing is not based on a read value indicating whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of the message, and then executing the processing based on the read value that indicates the processing must be done before sending the message. That is, the processing in Lonnroth is not dependent upon the read value. Thus, Lonnroth is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 14 and 18.

Thus, Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16 to 18, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over Lonnroth.

As a formal matter, an Information Disclosure Statement is being submitted concurrently herewith to cite a commonly-owned co-pending application (namely, Application No. 10/654,003, filed on September 4, 2003, and published as U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128369 on July 1, 2004) for which the subject matter thereof is related to the subject matter claimed herein. All art of record in the '003 application is also being cited in the IDS.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____
Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3957397v1